

**CMER Meeting  
December 14, 2000  
Minutes**

**Attendees:** Ken Risenhoover, Helen Bresler, Mark Hunter, Brian Fransen, Tim Quinn, Pete Heide, Mary Raines, Nancy Sturhan, Jim MacCracken, Blake Rowe, Craig Hansen

**Agenda:**

- Monitoring Design Team
- Scientific Review Committee Process
- Eastside RFP
- FPB to establish CMER
- SAG Reports

**Monitoring Design Team Process - Tim Quinn**

**Status** - The Monitoring Design Team (MDT) has developed several monitoring design templates for input processes, e.g. temperature, organic matter and nutrient dynamics, etc. Three monitoring levels are addressed: intensive watershed scale monitoring; extensive trend monitoring; and BMP effectiveness monitoring.

The template approach with intensive monitoring at the watershed scale is the best method to determine cumulative effects. Efforts will focus on a few watersheds. The focus of the extensive trend monitoring will be on state stratification that monitors progress through time and measure relatively easy variables. BMP effectiveness monitoring deals with direct cause and effect.

Although the BMP effectiveness monitoring is traditionally handled by SAGs, the intensive and extensive monitoring may not be the SAGs responsibility. MDT will set up study designs and flesh these approaches out a bit more.

Two other areas of monitoring expected to be addressed by the SAGs are: validation monitoring, involves long-term measuring; and development of monitoring tools.

There was a discussion of the roles of the SAG committees and their planning efforts, and how to avoid duplication and conflict with the MDT.

**Budget** - MDT requests up to \$30K to have NMFS flesh out the intensive and extensive monitoring details. NMFS has the GIS capability and layers needed for this effort. The MDT believes this is the most credible and efficient approach to accomplish this task. They expect the first cut by end of January. MDT expects to come up with a comprehensive program to include prioritization of efforts and associated costs, hopefully by April.

## **Scientific Review Committee Process**

CMER is in the process of reviewing a 3<sup>rd</sup> draft of Doug Martin's SRC Review Process.

Question: What about scientific input from outside of CMER? It should relate to research questions in L-1/L-2, be submitted to CMER, and undergo review by SAGs, CMER and the SRC, as the submission dictates.

Additional related Questions: What are the standards against which the SRC and CMER reviews will be compared? Should data from studies be assessed relative to the quality of info/data used to develop the rules? Industry representatives pointed out that such an assessment has never carried much weight in the past. Does SRC only make a scientific credibility decision or do they also make a recommendation for rule change (or not) to CMER? CMER agreed that the role of the SRC should be confined to assessing the scientific credibility of various CMER products, studies by other organizations as related to FFR, and CMER recommendations for rules changes (see SRC organizational proposal).

Key Summary Question: Is the approach taken by CMER studies based on testing the appropriateness of the standard or whether the management action will result in impacts to public resources? The approach to the study is strongly influenced by the answer.

Discussions led to questioning the level of proof needed to trigger a recommendation for a policy change or adaptive management response. Some CMER members argued that a departure from a standard or performance target should trigger a change while others suggested that those standards were often best guesses & the real issue is the impacts to a resource, e.g., why should the type n buffer strategy change due to 17 C water if that water temp. has no effect on torrent salamanders?

Tim Quinn will write a letter to policy to tee up this issue. Tim & Nancy will draft and distribute to CMER.

This discussion also highlighted the urgent need to get the SRC established & functioning. Groups outside CMER are currently conducting studies that relate to the FFR L-1 questions and are currently seeking to get those studies into the process.

## **Eastside RFP**

The Eastside SAG, a sub-group of RSAG, is preparing a RFP for an eastside workshop to help the advisory group identify eastside issues. A draft of the workshop description will be circulated shortly. The estimated cost of the workshop is \$5000. CMER agreed that this should go forward.

## **FPB to establish CMER**

CMER determined that we need a formalized structure with a list of members and their stakeholder affiliations to forward to the FPB for approval. CMER agreed a letter should be sent to FFR policy to outline the CMER structure and representation. Concepts to include in the letter were: its an open process and all TFW community members are invited to participate; each entity/caucus should have representation; consensus process; SAGs will be established as needed; and CMER should have discretion to select the chair.

Craig Hansen will draft a letter and distribute to CMER members for input.

Member organizations include but are not limited to federal agencies, state agencies, city and county governments, tribes, environmental groups, timber industry, and small forest landowners. It was agreed that three members of each stakeholder group will eventually make up the voting members of CMER. Stakeholders at the meeting attempted to designate "official" CMER members to include in the letter to FFR Policy. However, there were too many uncertainties and vacancies to complete this task. Names are now being obtained to include in the letter to FFR Policy.

## **SAG Reports**

LWAG - Jim MacCracken

- WRT issue in eastside riparian buffers is resolved. Permanent Rule language will fix.

RSAG - Mark Hunter

- the temperature workshop is scheduled for February 6 and 7
- DFC pilot work is underway
- RSAG recently lost its growth and yield expert – looking for replacement
- Alder Site Class issue being explored – DNR is doing initial data analysis
- RFP for hardwood research will be out soon.
- Eastside Sub-committee - Blake Rowe
  - developing the workplan

ISAG - Brian Fransen

- statistical sub-group meetings being held to evaluate statistical methods;
- need additional participation, especially from federal agencies.
- Washington Trout working on 2 contracts
  - Fish distribution surveys in unmanaged watersheds (Complete)
  - Organize and transfer WA Trout field survey data to support fish model development and testing (Ongoing)

UPSAG - Mary Raines

- working on draft workplan
- Board manual work (?)
- projects being prepared as proposals
  - manuals for field foresters to identify unstable slopes
- putting together a CMZ workshop

### **Finalizing the SRC Structure and Process Document**

M. Raines, T. Quinn, N. Sturhan, J. MacCracken, and B. Rowe returned following lunch to finalize the SRC document so that it can be forwarded to the FFR Policy Committee for approval and be taken up by the Forest Practices Board at its meeting in January 2001. A few minor editorial changes were made.

The group agreed that the document should be reorganized to present a list of alternative structures for the SRC with a CMER preferred alternative. Five alternatives will be presented with the CMER preferred alternative being the structure that many scientific journals use that includes a Managing Editor and several subject matter Associate Editors. The group also agreed that RFPs, study plans, workplans, etc. could benefit tremendously from direct interaction among reviewers and authors and that process may need to be iterative and open and the authors and reviewers may not remain anonymous. These changes will be made to the document and the document will then be sent to only those in attendance (unless others make a request) for final approval.